

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/717,420	11/19/2003	Igor Y. Botvinnik	112440-713	7759	
29190	7590 12/14/2005		EXAMINER		
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC			MAYEKAF	MAYEKAR, KISHOR	
P.O. BOX 1135 CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
Cincado, i	L 00090-1133		1753	-	
			DATE MAILED: 12/14/200	DATE MAILED: 12/14/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No. 10/717,420		Application No. Applicant(s)		,
		10/717,420	BOTVINNIK ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Kishor Mayekar	1753	
7 Period for F	he MAILING DATE of this communication app Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
WHICHE - Extension after SIX - If NO per - Failure to Any reply	TENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY EVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. From the mailing date of this communication, and for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, or received by the Office later than three months after the mailing atent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timused and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)⊠ Th 3)⊡ Sii	esponsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 O</u> is action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This note this application is in condition for allowards and in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		s
Disposition	of Claims			
4a) 5)□ Cl: 6)⊠ Cl: 7)□ Cl:	aim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application. Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawaim(s) is/are allowed. aim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected. aim(s) is/are objected to. aim(s) are subject to restriction and/or  Papers	vn from consideration.		
10)∐ The Ap Re	e specification is objected to by the Examine e drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acception and acception and request that any objection to the eplacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct e oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d	d).
Priority und	ler 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a) [ ] . 1.[ 2.[ 3.[	knowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  Certified copies of the priority documents  Copies of the certified copies of the prior  application from the International Bureau  the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)				
1)  Notice of 2)  Notice of 3) Informati	References Cited (PTO-892) Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) on Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) o(s)/Mail Date 10/05.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa		

#### DETAILED ACTION

## Claim Objections

1. Claim 21 stands objected to because of the typo error in the phrase "is receives".

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 3. Claims 1-6, 8, 11-23, 25, 26, 28-32, 34-37, 39, 42-48 and 50-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 4,789,801) in view of Natarajan et al. (US 4,264,343), for reasons as of record.
- 4. Claim 49 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee '801 in view of Natarayan '343, Weinberg '637 and Satyapal et al. (US 5,879,435), for reasons as of record.

### Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed October 3, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Lee discloses the use of the device as an electrostatic precipitator (see abstract) and further the refinement in the device for the increase of the precipitation efficiency (col. 10, lines 14-19), and suggests the use of intersecting non-mutually insulated electrodes in addition to the parallel mutually insulated electrode (col. 14, lines 13-25) and Natarajan shows, when additional electrodes are used downstream from the emitted electrodes if not embedded in a dielectric material, arcing or sparking occurs between the electrodes and the collector electrodes and the precipitation efficiency decreases (see abstract and col. 1, lines

42-48). As such, the motivation to combine Lee with Natarayan would be to embed the electrodes downstream from the emitter electrodes with a layer of a dielectric material to prevent arcing or sparking between the electrodes and the collector electrodes while increasing the precipitation efficiency.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

As to the rejection of claim 49, since Lee with Natarayan shows the above embedded electrodes, the rejection stands.

#### Conclusion

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the

advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kishor Mayekar whose telephone number is (571) 272-1339. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR

Application/Control Number: 10/717,420

Art Unit: 1753

only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kishor Mayekar Primary Examiner Page 6

Art Unit 1753